

United States Patent and Trademark Office

RP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/893,524	06/29/2001	Paul D. Perry	51481-5069	2982
28524	7590 10/02/2003		EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			GUSHI, ROSS N	
186 WOOD A		IVIEN I	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ISELIN, NJ	08830		2833	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	F	KF		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/893,524	PERRY ET AL.			
ravioury radion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ross N. Gushi	2833			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	ication. A proper replich places the application	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The drawe been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extermining the peri	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the stan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE late on which the petition under 37 CFR 1, insion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. Solution. 136(a) and the appropriate extended final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C 					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:				
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ection(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request to application in condition for allowance because: _		sidered but does NC	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	Y to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims v			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S:				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>5-13 and 19</u> .					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4, 14-18</u> .	`				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.		
9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				

Fou la

10. Other: ____

C ntinuati n Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/893,524

Application No.

*Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed limitations added to claim 1, including that the housing has a planar surface is a new limitation not previously considered and which would require substantial consideration. The claim as amended still reads on Mason et al. as set out in the previous Office action and determining whether the remaining rejected dependent claims would be allowable would take substantial consideration and a new analysis of the claims.

2